

Remarks/Arguments

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action in the present application. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claim 65 stands rejected under 35 USC §112; second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 65 has been amended to overcome the objection.

Claims 59-69 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,615,438 (Franco). Applicant has enclosed herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome the obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Applicant has also amended claims 59 and 67 to correct minor typographical errors, and claim 67 to more clearly define the claimed invention.

Applicant reserves the right to pursue the withdrawn claims 70-72 as filed in the context of a continuation application.

In view of the foregoing, all of the claims are deemed to be allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/615,210
Amendment Rule 111 dated September 29, 2004
Attorney Docket No.: 3769-003 US DIV
Reply to Office Action dated June 29, 2004

Dated: September 28, 2004
New York, New York

Respectfully submitted,

GOTTLIEB RACKMAN & REISMAN PC
Attorneys for Applicant
270 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016-0601
Telephone: (212) 684 3900
Telefax: (212) 684 3998

By: 

WEISZ, Tiberiu
Reg. No. 29,876

S:\belinda\amend\rule111\microheat\37693USDIV.doc